Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in Germany the usefulness of the book would be impaired by its almost total disregard of modern classical scholarship in other countries: one might say especially in Germany, since this information is there less easily accessible.

The heavy losses which classical scholarship has suffered during the brief period which has elapsed since the first edition was issued are recalled by the insertion of the names of Wölfflin, Bücheler, Blass, Furtwängler, and Traube. In the sketch of Wölfflin there is an error which, slight though it is, makes one a little dubious about Dr. Gudeman's figures in cases where he has had less favorable opportunities for getting first-hand information. According to the obituary notices sent out by his own family Wölfflin died November 8, not November 15.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Der Aufbau der plautinischen Cantica. Von S. SUDHAUS. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1909. Pp. vi+154.

The solo of Philolaches in the *Mostellaria* is symmetrical: the subject-matter falls into paragraphs; these paragraphs fall into periods; this symmetry in the exposition of the thought is attended by a corresponding symmetry in metrical structure. Such cases have long been familiar to students of Plautus, but Sudhaus is the first to seek such symmetry in a somewhat extended form in all the cantica. Small units within the metrical periods, the periods, the *Stollen*—these are the symmetrical parts that combine to form symmetrical wholes. *Rudens* 220–89 includes four *Stollen* in balanced pairs; the total number of *metra* in each of these four *Stollen* is, in sequence, 72:72:60:60. Within the *Stollen* the totals of *metra* reveal this remarkable structure:

12:8:16	8:12:16	16:12:8	16:12:8	8:8 : 12:8	16:8	16:8	8:8 : 6:7:7
20 :16	20 :16	16: 20	16: 20	16 : 20	24	24	16 : 20
36	36	36	36	36	24	24	36

The totals of *metra* in cantica, in *Stollen*, and in periods are divisible by four; this points to the symmetry of dance-movement. Both *Stollen* and periods are units of thought as well as of meter.

It is already clear that Sudhaus has applied to the cantica of Plautus the methods and principles applied to the cantica of Greek drama by Schroeder. The task is much more difficult in Latin comedy than in the Greek drama: the text-tradition, the ambiguity of Plautine prosody, militate against convincing conclusions; "es will auch gar nicht schnell überzeugen," the author admits, and asks only for careful testing of his theory. Unfortunately it will take the individual reader almost as long

to test the theory as it took Sudhaus to evolve it. For we have before us the application of the theory to a selected number of cantica, selected, the author assures us, on the basis of difficulty. Furthermore, the author will expect us, in extending his theory to other cantica, to revise the metrical interpretation of details, to find, for example, ionic measures where others have found "impure" bacchiuses. The ultimate test, therefore, is in the hands of the metrical specialist, expert in the methods of the new metric.

From the standpoint of a general student of Plautus it may be said at once that Sudhaus seems to me to have established a claim to a respectful hearing. It will not be charitable or even just to emphasize the fact that the author devotes much space to the discovery of glosses and lacunae, to transposition, and to emendation. His interpretation of the songs in the *Rudens*, mentioned above, involves almost no emendation, very little change in the *discriptio versuum*, slight novelty in the metrical interpretation of details. What he has done is to discern paragraphs in the thought, and through these, paragraphs in the metrical structure. This feature of his method should commend itself to every reasonable person who wishes to appreciate metrical structure from the poet's standpoint. The very fact that such a solo as that in the *Mostellaria* has clear demarcations in the thought corresponding to changes in the meter should prejudice us in favor of the new theory. Very likely the significance of such units of thought may be exaggerated, but it is in general so neglected in metrical studies that the emphasis put upon it in the present treatise is very welcome. It is at least striking that balanced conjunctional elements often stand prominently at the beginnings not only of paragraphs but of metrical periods; the καὶ μήν and ἀλλά in the epirrhematic structure of the Ἀγών of the old Attic comedy are recalled by this feature. In using units of thought, however, to determine the limits of smaller metrical units, the author does not always seem to be conscious of the depths of our ignorance of the underlying principles: when he insists that the thought determines our choice between the metrical divisions: *omnia adsunt* | *bona quem penest virtus* and *omnia adsunt bona* | *quem penest virtus*, he is begging a very large question if he means that, for the Roman reader, *bona* must stand in the same metrical unit with *omnia:* the facts point to the contrary in the case of this particular adjective. If, however, he means that the relative clause is more likely in Plautus to fill a distinct metrical unit, he may be right.

Sudhaus promises to discriminate between those cantica in which his theory is not dependent upon emendation and transposition and the like, and those which require adjustment. It cannot be said that he does this in a way that facilitates an appreciation of the strength or weakness of his argument. The essential features of the theory suffer because we are so often confronted by transpositions or excisions: the cantica rela-

tively free from corruption should be set in bolder relief. Ingenuity is always apparent, and in some cases the author has certainly been fortunate in finding that what interferes with his theory also offends scholars who are innocent of such a theory. But the total impression upon the reader is of uncertainty, of insecurity, that can be removed only by laborious effort. Even in details the argument is not always clear: Plautus is said not to use certain liberties in the cantica that are available in other meters; when we seek a reason for this, we find the implication that only under this condition will the theory hold. Such an account is valid when the theory is established, but at present we hardly know whether the theory supports the novelties in interpretation, or the novelties bolster up the theory.

It would be unfair, however, to charge all this confusion against the author; the subject is as perplexing a one as can be found, and the author's space was limited by the publisher. Sudhaus has rightly re-emphasized the importance of thought-units; he has indicated certain factors that must be reckoned with; he has not, however, prepared us for an immediate acceptance of his theory if it is to be applied to all the cantica. Finally, he should be encouraged to publish, in the manner of Schroeder's conspectuses of the lyrical measures of Greek drama, a complete conspectus of the Cantica Plautina in accord with his theory.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Daos: Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle. Par PH.-E. LEGRAND. *Annales de l'Université de Lyon*, Nouvelle Série II ("Droit, Lettres"). Fascicule 22. Lyon et Paris, 1910. Pp. 673.

A *tableau*, not a historical study: but the author often traces the antecedents, sometimes suggests causes; still the book remains essentially a description; the text with all the Gallic sense of perspective and clearness of exposition, the notes as rich a sourcebook of material as could be made in Germany. The volume never carries us so far in its account of any phase of the subject as Leo's essay on the monologue; almost every paragraph anticipates a monograph instead of being based upon one. Special students of the period and of the literary type will welcome it as the first competent attempt to reveal the content, the form, and the spirit of the New Comedy, but should regard it as a stimulus to further and more searching historical study of every phase of the New Comedy. There could be no more admirable introduction to such historical study of details than this well-proportioned sketch of the whole field by one whose knowledge of Hellenistic poetry is enviable.